

Amendments to the Drawing Figures:

The attached drawing sheets include: (1) proposed changes to FIG. 4, and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 4; and (2) a new FIG. 6 showing an embodiment having more than three shaving heads. No new matter is added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet for FIG. 4 and New Sheet for FIG. 6.

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

By this Amendment, Applicants: amend claim 4 and add a new FIG. 6; amend the specification to make reference to the change to FIG. 4 and the new FIG. 6; amend claims 1, and 3-6; and add new claims 8-14. Accordingly, claims 8-14 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objects to the drawings as supposedly failing to show three features – two features in the claims and one feature mentioned in the specification, namely: (1) number of shaving heads being more than three; (2) elements on the shear-plate holder; and (3) ribs or grooves formed on the wall of the cavity in the spindle.

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new FIG. 6 to show the number of shaving heads being more than three, and have amended FIG. 4 to show the ribs. By this Amendment the recitation of elements on the shear-plate holder is deleted from claims 4-5 and thus the drawing objection is deemed moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as supposedly not describing in the specification elements formed in the shear-plate.

By this Amendment the recitation of elements on the shear-plate holder is deleted from claims 4-5 and thus the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is deemed moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 4-5

under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Cooksey U.S. Patent 3,314,146 ("Cooksey"), and claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Bijl et al. U.S. Patent 4,257,161 ("Bijl") in view of Park U.S. Patent 5,129,275 ("Park").

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7 are all patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Cooksey

Claim 1

Among other things, the shaving apparatus of claim 1 includes: (1) a housing; (2) a plurality of shaving heads, each comprising a circular shear plate and a rotatable cutting member associated with the shear plate; and (3) a sheer-plate holder mounted on the housing and holding the plurality of shear plates.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cooksey clearly does not disclose or suggest any shaving apparatus including this combination of features.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is clearly patentable over Cooksey.

Claims 2 and 6-7

Claims 2 and 6-7 depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5

Claims 4 and 5 no longer depend from claim 1, and now depend from claim 3, which was not rejected over Cooksey.

Bijl in View of Park

Claim 1

Among other things, in the shaving apparatus of claim 1 the axes of rotation of the drive rims are oriented at angles relative to each other and diverge from each other in a direction from the drive rim to the coupling end.

The Office Action states that Bijl discloses:

"the axes of rotation (22) for each drive rim (7) is oriented perpendicularly but diverges from the center of the shaving head as it approaches the coupling end (see Figure 3)."

Applicants respectfully disagree. The "axes of rotation 22" are not the axes of rotation of the drive rim 7, but instead are axes of rotation of the coupling spindle 6, as clearly shown in FIG. 3, and as explicitly disclosed by Bijl at col. 2, lines 52-57. Furthermore, the axes of rotation 22 of coupling spindles 6 are not coincident with the axes of rotation of the gear wheels 7 (see also page 1, line 16 – page 2, line 5 of the present specification).

Very clearly, Bijl does not disclose that the axes of rotation of the gear wheels 7 are oriented at angles relative to each other and diverge from each other in a direction from the gear wheel to the coupling end.

Therefore no possible combination of Bijl and Park could ever produce the shaving apparatus of claim 1 including this feature.

The Office Action states that:

"Bijl teaches all of the elements of the current invention as stated above except the drive rims meeting the central gear at different, diverging angles, each angle at least three degrees."

Applicants respectfully do not see a recitation of any feature wherein *"the drive rims meet the central gear at different, diverging angles, each angle at least three degrees"* in claim 1 . . . or any other claim for that matter. Indeed, claim 1 does not even recite any "central gear."

So Applicants see no explanation in the Office Action as to why Park is being cited against claim 1. In any event, Applicants traverse any proposed combination of Bijl and Park with respect to claims 1-3 and 6 as lacking any suggestion or motivation

in the prior art to one of ordinary skill in the art, and as not producing the claimed invention in any event. Absolutely nothing in Park teaches or suggests either the above-mentioned feature described in the Office Action (which in any event is not recited in any claim), or any relevant feature that is actually recited in claim 1 or any other claim.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is clearly patentable over any possible combination of Bijl and Park.

Claims 2 & 6

Claims 2 & 6 depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 3

Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form without any change of scope.

Among other things, in the shaving apparatus of claim 3 the axes of rotation of the drive rims are oriented at angles relative to each other and diverge from each other in a direction from the drive rim to the coupling end.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, no possible combination of Bijl and Park could ever produce a shaving apparatus including this feature.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is clearly patentable over any possible combination of Bijl and Park.

Claims 4 and 5

Claims 4 & 5 depend from claim 3 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, and for the following additional reasons.

In the shaving apparatus of claim 5, the shear plates extend at angles with respect to each other.

Neither Bijl nor Park nor any combination thereof discloses or suggest such a feature.

Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, claim 5 is deemed patentable over the cited art.

CLAIMS 8-14

Claims 8-14 depend variously from claims 1 and 3 and are deemed patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 3, and for the inclusion of additional novel and unobvious features variously recited in these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-14 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT

By:



Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740